

to maintain and improve the landscape features, excluding streets and sidewalks, in the irregular shaped grassy areas bounded by Washington Avenue, SW on the northeast, Second Street SW on the west, Square 582 on the south, and the beginning of the I-395 tunnel on the southeast.

SEC. 208. LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriation Act.

SEC. 209. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to establish or operate a smoking area in the cafeteria and public dining areas of the Rayburn House Office Building.

SEC. 210. For fiscal year 2007 only, all authorities previously exercised by the Architect of the Capitol, including but not limited to the execution and supervision of contracts; and the hiring, supervising, training, and compensation of employees, shall be vested in the Comptroller General of the United States or his designee: *Provided*, That this delegation of authority shall terminate with the confirmation of a new Architect of the Capitol.

This Act may be cited as the "Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2007".

The Acting CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in House Report 109-487. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 109-487.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 109-487.

□ 1300

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 109-487.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 109-487.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BAIRD

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. BAIRD:

Page 13, line 13, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$2,400,000)".

Page 36, line 3, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(decreased by \$2,400,000)".

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 849, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is my understanding that my respective chairman and ranking member have some concerns about the amendment, and I intend to withdraw it, therefore. However, I would like to speak to it briefly, if I may.

Many of us who have served here for a number of years still find ourselves, unfortunately, lost when we travel in the basement of this building or some of the other office buildings. That is a frustrating and sometimes humorous experience for us under normal circumstances, but in an emergency situation it could be a matter of life and death.

I am aware that there are firms that specialize in the electronic mapping of facilities precisely such as this for the purpose of helping first responders respond more quickly and ably in the event of an emergency. Indeed, schools throughout my State have been mapped in such a way, as is our capital complex in Washington State today.

What I am asking for with this amendment is the diversion of \$2.4 million that is currently allocated towards the House Printing Office in order that the Architect of the Capitol could invest in an electronic mapping system to provide this function.

Let me describe briefly what can happen with these electronic mapping systems. Essentially, rather than relying on the Architect of the Capitol to have a bunch of hard copy blueprints that would be presumably folded out in a time of crisis, the entire complex would be mapped in an electronic form such that the information about the complex could be downloaded and available on laptops, PDAs or other electronic means. This could include response plans, hazardous materials locations, and paths of egress or ingress.

Imagine had Flight 93 hit this Capitol, the chaos and the smoke and the toxic fumes that would have engulfed this building, we could easily have had Members of Congress, staff, members of the public trapped in unaccessible locations that the first responders would not even know how to reach.

What we are asking for today is that we invest in a system that will make it possible for our first responders, our Capitol Police, firefighters from on grounds or off grounds to respond promptly, efficiently to save lives and to restore order as needed.

This is a relatively small investment for what could one day be a profound and important life-saving measure. I would encourage my good friends, the chairman and ranking member, to work with me in the future on this measure.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, Mr. OBEY and I have both understood for years that if you wander through the Rayburn Building and do not get lost, you have been here too long. With that, I think you have a very good proposal.

Mr. BAIRD. I thank the gentleman, and hope that we might be able to work on this in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 109-487.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 109-487.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 109-487.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN) having assumed the chair, Mr. LINDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5521) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 849, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1315

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

#### EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS AND SUPPORT FOR GREATER OPPORTUNITIES FOR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, ENGINEERING, AND MATHEMATICS (GO-STEM) PROGRAMS

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 421) expressing the sense of Congress and support for Greater Opportunities for Science, Technology, Engineering,

and Mathematics (GO-STEM) programs, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 421

Whereas in October 2005, the Government Accountability Office released a study on Federal science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) programs and concluded that the Federal Government funds 207 education-related STEM programs across 13 separate Federal agencies;

Whereas in the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-171), the Congress established the Academic Competitiveness Council in order to identify all Federal education programs with a mathematics and science focus;

Whereas the Academic Competitiveness Council is chaired by the Secretary of Education and brings together officials from across the Federal Government;

Whereas the Academic Competitiveness Council is charged with determining the effectiveness of each program and identifying areas of overlap or duplication; and

Whereas the Academic Competitiveness Council has up to one year after February 2006 to release its report and will recommend ways to efficiently integrate and coordinate the programs: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—*

(1) mathematics and science education programs across Federal agencies should be better coordinated;

(2) there should be minimal duplication among these programs and consistent standards of evaluation;

(3) the Department of Education should be commended for its rapid response in creating the Academic Competitiveness Council; and

(4) the recommendations of the Academic Competitiveness Council should be closely examined when making decisions about Federal funding for mathematics and science education programs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 421.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I initially want to start and thank the chairman and staff of the Education and Workforce Committee, and Members on both sides, cosponsors on both sides of the aisle here, for their support and their assistance as we bring this important resolution forward.

A couple of quotes from the Hart-Rudman Commission report in 2001: "The harsh fact is that the United States need for the highest quality human capital in science, mathematics and engineering is not being met. Another reason for the growing deficit in

high-quality human capital is that the American kindergarten through 12th grade education system is not performing as well as it should."

And then just a year and a half ago, the former Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich said, "The biggest challenge for the United States domestically is to fundamentally, profoundly overhaul math and science education. This is a real crisis."

Mr. Speaker, in order to sustain America's economic growth and national security, United States must remain at the cutting edge of innovation and ingenuity in such fields as science, technology, engineering and mathematics, often referred to as STEM. And staying at the cutting edge will only happen by putting the right workforce in place for the 21st century.

Creating the 21st century workforce begins by answering the domestic demand for occupations like scientists and engineers. In fact, the demand for scientists and engineers is expected to increase at four times the rate of all other occupations over the next decade.

Already the Federal Government makes a sizeable investment to promote STEM-related occupations through education initiatives. But if the Federal Government is going to continue to have such a role, it makes sense to take a look at the current Federal programs, the total investment of those programs and gauge the effectiveness of those programs.

In October 2005, the Government Accountability Office released a study on Federal STEM programs and concluded the Federal Government funds 207 education programs across 13 separate Federal agencies. In total, those programs cost \$2.8 billion in fiscal year 2004. However, only 51 of the 207 programs received \$10 million or more, meaning that most received not a substantial investment.

In the study, the GAO went on to conclude that before adopting any changes, it is important to know the extent to which existing STEM education programs are appropriately targeted and making the best use of available Federal resources.

Based upon the recommendations of the GAO, Congress went on to establish the Academic Competitiveness Council in order to identify all Federal education programs with a math and science focus. The primary duties of the council are to determine the effectiveness of each program and identify areas of overlap or duplication.

Now, the rudimentary evidence points to a system that is fragmented and in need of much better coordination. Congress is eagerly anticipating the report of the Academic Competitiveness Council to see how the larger facts bear out, and to that end the Department of Education and other Federal agencies should be commended for their rapid response in creating the council and their aggressiveness in finding the truth.

But as Congress examines the investments made on math and science education, the effort also must focus on duplication and standards of evaluation. Federal resources are precious, and it is the responsibility of Congress to ensure that money is not being thrown at repetitive or duplicative efforts and that these programs can be properly monitored for their effectiveness.

Instead of spreading money around on programs that span the Federal Government and lack an overall coherent plan, Congress must direct the money to the best possible use in a consistent manner. The recommendations of the Academic Competitiveness Council should be closely watched and bring semblance to math and science education programs. This resolution would move us in that direction.

So I urge my colleagues to adopt this resolution. Now is the time to affirm the importance of such an investment, but also to properly evaluate the recommendations produced by the council. As America looks to sustain its economic vitality and national security, investments in the field of science, technology, engineering and math are too important to leave fragmented and without proper guidance.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we rise in support of this legislation. We think that it is important that we do get a handle on those programs that the Federal Government currently supports in the fields of science, technology, engineering and mathematics.

Late last year, the Democratic Caucus introduced an innovation agenda, and that innovation agenda was designed to make sure that America would retain its competitiveness and America would be able to go forward into this century as a leader in math, science and engineering and a leader in innovation, a place that America has held for the last 50 years. We have held that position in the world because of an investment that was made by President Kennedy to go to the Moon and to return safely, and the infrastructure that was built up by that decision. President Kennedy understood it was more than just a moon shot. It was about building an infrastructure in math, science and engineering for this country for the future. And that decision led to the greatest public-private partnership in the history of the world and created an infrastructure today that we continue to live off of and that has driven this economy for that same period of time.

□ 1330

The question is whether or not we need to renew that investment. Clearly those people who are participating in this economy at the highest levels, on the cutting edge, those who are creating new start-ups, who have created some of the great companies of the

world in high technology, biotech and engineering, tell us that it is absolutely imperative that America make this effort.

They have made it also clear to us that the foundation of this is the American education system; that not only must we fully fund No Child Left Behind, as the American Electronics Association called for, but we have to make a new commitment to graduate studies, we have to make a new commitment to the teachers of math, science and engineering at all levels, and we have got to make a new commitment to research and development.

So this resolution is quite timely, because it is important that we understand not only why these programs are on the books, the purposes for which they are created, but do they still work in today's environment, should they be modified, should they be merged, should they be given new purposes.

We know that the National Science Foundation outside of the Department of Education has created some of the most effective programs for young people to become excited about the physical sciences and the life sciences and to understand the world around them, and have engaged students in a way that they are unlikely to be engaged with the traditional textbook approach to those sciences.

In my own State of California, we now see the University of California initiating a new program where those students of math, science and engineering will be able to concurrently achieve a teaching credential, so not only will they be fully skilled in the core subject matters of engineering and math and science, but they will also, if they decide to go into the teaching field, be fully qualified to teach those subject matters and create that excitement that we talk about so much, so that young people will truly see the value and the excitement of studying and entering careers that deeply involve math, science and engineering.

If we fail to do this, if we fail to do more than this resolution, if the national science programs continue to come under budget pressure, then the problem will be that we can lose that leadership in fields of innovation where America has been so terribly strong.

We now see strategic investments being made in the educational facilities, in the research facilities, all along the Asian Rim, by India, by China, by Indonesia, by Korea, in the field of telecommunications and the field of technology and the field of biosciences; and it is terribly important for our economy here at home, for the jobs of the future and for our leadership in the world and a matter of our national security, certainly, in the technology fields. The only way we are going to be able to do that, according to those people who are betting their companies, betting their shareholders' money, betting borrowed money and the venture capitalists staking their future on it, is to engage in a full and comprehensive

program for competitiveness and innovation.

In the Democratic proposal, the challenge that we have laid down to this Congress, that challenge is to create a new generation of innovators, and this legislation speaks to this because it speaks to the education programs that will be available and the effectiveness of those programs for math, science and engineering.

We also speak to that by making sure that there are graduate fellowships, much as we did again in the effort to reach the Moon in the Kennedy administration where 28,000 fellowships were given. Those individuals finished their graduate studies early and became part of that great foundation of American ingenuity and competitiveness.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I, too, want to support this resolution and draw attention to the needs that we have in the areas of science, engineering and math for the education establishments in this country. We dramatically need to improve the number of highly qualified teachers with core competencies in these fields; we dramatically need to increase the number of young people who are excited by this; and we dramatically need to increase the number of young people who want to choose this as a career, as a profession, as a place of excitement and innovation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member for his support, and yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON), the chairman of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution to recognize the ever-increasing importance of science, technology, engineering and mathematics programs, to which we have given the acronym STEM. As you know, this is an issue on which the Education and the Workforce Committee has provided considerable leadership over the last several years, particularly during the No Child Left Behind era and through our recent efforts to strengthen the Higher Education Act.

Right now, our committee is immersed in a series of hearings on the current state and future prospects of our Nation's STEM programs. At these hearings, we have heard from Secretary of Labor Chao and Secretary of Education Spellings, who discussed the Bush administration's view on the STEM programs. We have also heard from a variety of other Federal officials, as well as educators and businessmen and women from across the Nation.

A common theme throughout their testimony was this: In order to determine where to go next with regard to Federal involvement in STEM programs, it is best to gain a better understanding of where we already are.

Congress has taken steps to determine just that. Last fall, the Govern-

ment Accountability Office issued a report that quantified the many Federal programs established to increase the number of students pursuing science, technology, engineering and math degrees. In fiscal year 2004 alone, we spent about \$2.8 billion on these programs, and the GAO has recommended that before creating new Federal math and science programs, we should know which existing programs are appropriately targeted and making the best use of Federal resources.

Following that logic, earlier this year, as part of the Deficit Reduction Act, Congress established an Academic Competitiveness Council designed to identify and review the more than 200 programs within the 13 separate Federal agencies with a math or science focus. The council will evaluate the effectiveness of the programs, determine areas of duplication and recommend ways in which to integrate and coordinate them. Its activities recently began in earnest, and a final report must be submitted to Congress by February 2007.

Mr. Speaker, Congress, the Federal Government and our Nation's academic and business communities must gain a better understanding of what programs already exist to improve STEM education, how effective these programs are and, most importantly of all, what we can do to improve them.

Simply put, for our Nation to remain competitive in a rapidly changing global marketplace, we must sharpen our focus in STEM programs. I applaud our efforts to improve them, and I support this resolution.

I thank my colleague from Georgia, Dr. PRICE, for bringing it to the floor.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me time. I also want to commend Representative PRICE for his introduction of this legislation, and I am pleased to join with him, Chairman McKEON and Ranking Member MILLER as we express support for H. Con. Res. 421.

Supporting mathematics and science in education is crucial to national prosperity. The United States workforce is dramatically changing, and the demand for highly skilled jobs is increasing. In the last 10 years, employment in science, technology, engineering and mathematics, STEM fields, as we call them, have increased by an estimated 23 percent, particularly in mathematics and in computer science. This growth will only continue by 2020. Fifteen million new jobs that require college-educated and highly skilled workers will be created.

However, and unfortunately, we have seen a recent drop in students' educational interest in STEM-related fields. In 2004, only 27 percent of degrees awarded were in STEM fields, compared to 32 percent of degrees in

1995. We need to ensure that our students are adequately prepared for the changing economy, and supporting quality programs in STEM-related fields is essential to reach this goal.

The goals of the Academic Competitiveness Council are to evaluate the effectiveness of each STEM-related program across the government, identify areas of overlap and recommend ways to efficiently integrate and coordinate in the future.

It is important that the Academic Competitiveness Council and this Congress continue to focus on a high-quality investment in STEM training. Further, it is important that we work to increase the participation of minority groups and women, who are seriously underrepresented in STEM fields. Inclusion of women and underrepresented minorities in STEM will help correct the historical employment inequities that have existed in our country and help supply the American economy with the STEM expertise that the country needs to innovate and remain competitive.

Just last month, we heard from the administration that the creation and operation of the Academic Competitiveness Council is under way and that they are working to make concrete recommendations. Congress has a responsibility to thoughtfully consider these recommendations, accepting those that are reasonable and rejecting recommendations that could undermine or undercut progress.

It is incumbent upon us to ensure that the needs met by current activities continue to be addressed, and even strengthened where needed. We must not eliminate critical and crucially needed activities solely in the name of consolidation.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time on this legislation. Again, I want to thank Mr. PRICE and Mr. McKEON for bringing this bill to the floor, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to once again reiterate my thanks to the ranking member and to Mr. DAVIS for their support and for the support of all the cosponsors on both sides of the aisle who understand and appreciate the importance of this resolution. I am so pleased to stand with both Republicans and Democrats who appreciate that Federal resources are precious, but also that they are finite. It is our responsibility, Congress' responsibility, to provide the oversight and to be certain that hard-earned taxpayer money is wisely spent.

This resolution is truly a win-win. It allows Congress to be certain that the money is being spent effectively, and it

reiterates our appreciation and support for increasing the interests in science, technology, engineering and mathematics education.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following correspondence.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE  
WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, June 6, 2006.

Hon. SHERWOOD BOEHLERT,  
Chairman, Committee on Science, Rayburn  
House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BOEHLERT: Thank you for your recent letter regarding the consideration of H. Con. Res. 421, expressing support for Greater Opportunities for Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics programs. I appreciate your efforts to improve the text of the resolution. When the bill is considered on the floor, the changes you have suggested will be included in a manager's amendment.

I also appreciate your agreement to not request a sequential referral and your willingness to forgo consideration of H. Con. Res. 421 by your committee. I agree that waiving consideration of H. Con. Res. 421 in no way diminishes or alters the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Science. I will include your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during the bill's consideration on the House floor.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE,  
Washington, DC, June 6, 2006.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON,  
Chairman, Committee on Education and the  
Workforce, Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Science Committee in matters being considered in H. Con. Res. 421, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress and support for Greater Opportunities for Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (GO-STEM) programs. This measure deals with matters in the jurisdiction of the Science Committee, including the education programs of the National Science Foundation, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the Department of Energy.

I appreciate your willingness to work with me to satisfy my concerns about the language in H. Con. Res. 421 by modifying language in the measure so that we are not prejudging any recommendations of the Academic Competitiveness Council. The Science Committee acknowledges the importance of H. Con. Res. 421 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, pursuant to our agreement to modify the language of the measure, I agree not to request a sequential referral. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forgo a sequential referral waives, reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Science Committee. I would appreciate it if you would include a copy of this letter and your response in the Congressional Record when the measure is considered on the House Floor.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

SHERWOOD BOEHLERT,  
Chairman.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to comment positively on H. Con. Res. 421, but also to express some concerns about it. I commend Representative TOM PRICE for his interest in supporting Greater Opportunities for Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math—collectively, STEM—programs and I thank him for including a change in the manager's amendment. STEM education is extremely important to our Nation, because our economic and national security rely on technical and innovative expertise in these fields. However, I am concerned that this resolution, despite the change in the manager's amendment, still gives premature support to the Academic Competitiveness Council's—ACC—recommendations, which are not due until February 2007.

The impetus for the ACC sprang from a 2005 Government Accountability Office study on Federal STEM programs. It is my understanding that Federal agencies with STEM programs have a seat at the ACC table. However, I am concerned that not all agencies have an equal appreciation or understanding of the importance of STEM education in improving our national competitiveness and security.

The National Science Foundation—NSF—has a proven track record of expertise and experience in STEM programs. We all know that NSF grants have led to truly revolutionary discoveries and technical advances. NSF-funded researchers have won more than 160 Nobel Prizes, and these pioneers have included the scientists or teams that discovered many of the fundamental particles of matter and decoded the genetics of viruses. But many do not know that another essential element in NSF's mission is support for science and engineering education, from pre-K through graduate school and beyond. The research that the NSF funds is thoroughly integrated with education to help ensure that there will always be plenty of skilled people available to work in new and emerging scientific, engineering and technological fields, and plenty of capable teachers to educate the next generation. Since the NSF has been a leader in STEM education for more than 50 years and has established excellent evaluations for all of its programs, the ACC should give very strong recognition to the role NSF and its education programs play in promoting our economic competitiveness and national security, and they should build upon the strengths of the NSF. The treasure trove of knowledge the foundation represents should not be overlooked, but, in fact, should be used as a base for the ACC recommendations.

Specifically, I am concerned that the GO-STEM resolution calls for "minimal duplication among [STEM] programs" without defining what this means and also goes further than the established goals for the ACC that are set out in the Deficit Reduction Act. For years, I have been promoting the Math and Science Partnership programs at the Department of Education—ED—and the National Science

Foundation. Unfortunately, because both agency's programs have the same name, some have mistakenly thought of these programs as equivalent, even though they are in name only, and duplicative, even though they most definitely are not. I am working on legislation to change the name of the NSF program to help avoid future confusion. Among other differences, the NSF program is designed to provide rigorous, scientifically based research on what works in STEM teacher professional development whereas ED's program is designed to implement these ideas on the State level. A wide array of teachers, scientists and education researchers agree that there is much research needed in the areas addressed by the NSF Math and Science Partnership program, yet the President's budget has called for eliminating new research in the NSF program.

Since there has been significant confusion about different STEM programs, I am pleased that the ACC will focus on coordination and strengthening the Federal STEM endeavor. There is a plethora of STEM education programs across many different Federal agencies. The goal of the GO-STEM resolution—to better coordinate Federal STEM education efforts—is needed and is very admirable. However, I do not want to put the cart before the horse, and prefer that Congress carefully consider whatever recommendations the ACC puts forth before adopting them.

Additionally, the GO-STEM resolution calls for "consistent standards of evaluation." While this is a laudable goal, apples cannot be compared to oranges. In particular, I am concerned that new programs could receive failing grades since they have not had time to demonstrate results. Will the new SMART grants, a tremendous tool for bolstering the STEM education pipeline, receive a "results not demonstrated" designation as other new programs do in PART reviews? Furthermore, we should expect very different outcomes from programs that focus on student learning compared to programs that focus on graduate-level research in the physical sciences. The tools used to define "effective" are extremely critical. I am uncertain what evaluative methodology the ACC will adopt to define "effective," and, therefore, am very reluctant to give premature support to the ACC's recommendations.

I urge that Members pay very close attention to the ACC's recommendations. But please, think critically about the evaluative methodology the ACC uses in developing its recommendations, and recognize and build upon the existing expertise of agencies such as the National Science Foundation. Also, think very hard about how our actions will affect our economic competitiveness and national security before considering eliminating any STEM-related programs.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 421, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the con-

current resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# MINE IMPROVEMENT AND NEW EMERGENCY RESPONSE ACT OF 2006

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 2803) to amend the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 to improve the safety of mines and mining.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 2803

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Mine Improvement and New Emergency Response Act of 2006" or the "MINER Act".

## SEC. 2. EMERGENCY RESPONSE.

Section 316 of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 876) is amended—

(1) in the section heading by adding at the end the following: "AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLANS";

(2) by striking "Telephone" and inserting "(a) IN GENERAL.—Telephone"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) ACCIDENT PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Each underground coal mine operator shall carry out on a continuing basis a program to improve accident preparedness and response at each mine.

"(2) RESPONSE AND PREPAREDNESS PLAN.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the Mine Improvement and New Emergency Response Act of 2006, each underground coal mine operator shall develop and adopt a written accident response plan that complies with this subsection with respect to each mine of the operator, and periodically update such plans to reflect changes in operations in the mine, advances in technology, or other relevant considerations. Each such operator shall make the accident response plan available to the miners and the miners' representatives.

"(B) PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—An accident response plan under subparagraph (A) shall—

"(i) provide for the evacuation of all individuals endangered by an emergency; and

"(ii) provide for the maintenance of individuals trapped underground in the event that miners are not able to evacuate the mine.

"(C) PLAN APPROVAL.—The accident response plan under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to review and approval by the Secretary. In determining whether to approve a particular plan the Secretary shall take into consideration all comments submitted by miners or their representatives. Approved plans shall—

"(i) afford miners a level of safety protection at least consistent with the existing standards, including standards mandated by law and regulation;

"(ii) reflect the most recent credible scientific research;

"(iii) be technologically feasible, make use of current commercially available technology, and account for the specific physical characteristics of the mine; and

"(iv) reflect the improvements in mine safety gained from experience under this Act and other worker safety and health laws.

"(D) PLAN REVIEW.—The accident response plan under subparagraph (A) shall be reviewed periodically, but at least every 6

months, by the Secretary. In such periodic reviews, the Secretary shall consider all comments submitted by miners or miners' representatives and intervening advancements in science and technology that could be implemented to enhance miners' ability to evacuate or otherwise survive in an emergency.

"(E) PLAN CONTENT-GENERAL REQUIREMENTS.—To be approved under subparagraph (C), an accident response plan shall include the following:

"(i) POST-ACCIDENT COMMUNICATIONS.—The plan shall provide for a redundant means of communication with the surface for persons underground, such as secondary telephone or equivalent two-way communication.

"(ii) POST-ACCIDENT TRACKING.—Consistent with commercially available technology and with the physical constraints, if any, of the mine, the plan shall provide for above ground personnel to determine the current, or immediately pre-accident, location of all underground personnel. Any system so utilized shall be functional, reliable, and calculated to remain serviceable in a post-accident setting.

"(iii) POST-ACCIDENT BREATHABLE AIR.—The plan shall provide for—

"(I) emergency supplies of breathable air for individuals trapped underground sufficient to maintain such individuals for a sustained period of time;

"(II) in addition to the 2 hours of breathable air per miner required by law under the emergency temporary standard as of the day before the date of enactment of the Mine Improvement and New Emergency Response Act of 2006, caches of self-rescuers providing in the aggregate not less than 2 hours per miner to be kept in escapeways from the deepest work area to the surface at a distance of no further than an average miner could walk in 30 minutes;

"(III) a maintenance schedule for checking the reliability of self rescuers, retiring older self-rescuers first, and introducing new self-rescuer technology, such as units with interchangeable air or oxygen cylinders not requiring doffing to replenish airflow and units with supplies of greater than 60 minutes, as they are approved by the Administration and become available on the market; and

"(IV) training for each miner in proper procedures for donning self-rescuers, switching from one unit to another, and ensuring a proper fit.

"(iv) POST-ACCIDENT LIFELINES.—The plan shall provide for the use of flame-resistant directional lifelines or equivalent systems in escapeways to enable evacuation. The flame-resistance requirement of this clause shall apply upon the replacement of existing lifelines, or, in the case of lifelines in working sections, upon the earlier of the replacement of such lifelines or 3 years after the date of enactment of the Mine Improvement and New Emergency Response Act of 2006.

"(v) TRAINING.—The plan shall provide a training program for emergency procedures described in the plan which will not diminish the requirements for mandatory health and safety training currently required under section 115.

"(vi) LOCAL COORDINATION.—The plan shall set out procedures for coordination and communication between the operator, mine rescue teams, and local emergency response personnel and make provisions for familiarizing local rescue personnel with surface functions that may be required in the course of mine rescue work.

"(F) PLAN CONTENT-SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the content requirements contained in subparagraph (E), and subject to the considerations contained in subparagraph (C), the Secretary